COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KK684B	**Scope (hp):** 15,0 hp
Course title: Socially Engaged Research	
Course coordinator: Gottschalk Sara	**Number of registered students:** 23
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT26	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. HAKIF-HT2025	

Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) A minor formative evaluation was conducted at the mid-presentation 250505	**Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):** 20 students
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) ☐ Only via Canvas ☐ Canvas and other form ☐ Only other form (written and/or oral) Canvas and other form (orally after the final presentation, 250603)	**Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:** Written course evaluation: 9 Oral course evaluation: 5

Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the students oral and written feedback:

Students were broadly positive about the course (4,3 in average). The comments point to four main strengths:

1. Practical application and work with external partners. The most frequently mentioned strength was the opportunity to apply theory in practice by working with real case owners and stakeholders. Students described this as an exceptionally valuable experience that helped them build connections, and they appreciated being received and respected by their case owner. One student also valued learning more about cultural institutions in the city.

2. Group work and collaboration. Students felt that working in groups developed important skills, including analysing a case study and collaborating across differences in culture, background, and personality. Having a group with good intentions was highlighted as a positive.

3. Course structure and staged assessment. The three-part presentation structure (mid-term, rehearsal, and final presentation) helped students stay consistent and keep on top of deadlines. The course structure and guidance around the group project with external stakeholders were also appreciated, as were the presentations during the process.

4. Teaching and feedback. Students found the lectures enlightening, particularly the introductory lectures on different types of research, and valued the chance to engage in a participatory research process. The lecturers' feedback was described as very helpful, and students felt that the teachers cared about their work and development.

Students perspectives on what can be improved:

1. Workload and assessment. Students suggested reducing the number of assignments and hand-ins so that more time and focus can go to the group project. They noted that group dynamics and the involvement of external actors already made the project demanding.

2. Clarity of course purpose and expectations. Students felt there was some difficulty at the start in distinguishing between the goals of the course and those of a design project. They recommended making this distinction explicit to both students and potential case owners during project planning, and emphasising that students come from cultural studies and will approach challenges from that perspective.

3. Involvement and follow-up with supervisors and case owners. Students would like supervisors to be invited to some lectures or seminars so that expectations and possible tension points within the group or between actors can be discussed.

4. Programme-level suggestions. One student proposed renaming the master's programme *Cultural Theory and Practice* to clarify its purpose for students, teachers, and employers. The same student recommended scheduling the practice component (practical skills and applied theory) so that it does not compete with earlier papers, and placing the Impact part after students have delivered something, tailored to help them apply it to their output.

From the oral evaluation (which have asked questions more specifically adressing the activities in the course:

Support during the course (supervision and feedback)

- Supervision generally worked well, but not all groups felt they received equally timely help from their supervisors.
- *Next year:* clarify expectations for supervisors, and if a supervisor does not have the practical time, they should not supervise.
- Both internal presentations were good, but students wanted more time for feedback at the first feedback session.
- The way peer-review feedback was organised was appreciated.

Classes and lectures

- Students were satisfied with the teaching.
- Topics they would have liked added:
    - Project management, project structure, roles, and project dynamics
    - Visualisation: how to present ideas and models visually (suggested as a workshop)
    - How to manage case owners' expectations (a discussion would suffice)

Research impact component

- It felt somewhat forced or out of place.
- It could come later in the course (e.g. after the mid-term presentation), as some groups had not progressed far enough to know how to use it.
- Some felt it served the lecturer more than the students.

Non-examined assignments

- Considered good.
- It would help to explain why students should save, digitise, or photograph their ideas before the workshop, since the material is divided up afterwards.

Examined assignments

- Considered good.
- The oral presentation became stressful at first because case owners arrived late.
- Case owners and supervisors coming and going was disruptive. Suggestions:
    - Schedule 5-minute breaks between presentations so people can enter and leave without disturbing.
    - Inform students early that supervisors and case owners may only attend their own group's presentation (staying longer is a bonus).
    - Welcome everyone at the start and lighten the mood, as some students were nervous.

Other

- The course was experienced as very well organised, which was appreciated (students felt not all programme courses have been).
- Many students were still struggling with assignments from the previous course (position papers 1 and 2), which interfered with this course.
- Group work can be burdened when some students work a lot outside their studies or travel during the course.

MALMÖ UNIVERSITY

Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Summary of the teacher's views:

My general impression is that the course worked fine, that the students did a good job, presented interesting results on their cases and that the relationship between students, teachers, supervisors and case-owners were good.

Comments on the students´recommendation for improvements from the evaluation:

1. Students suggested reducing the number of assignments and hand-ins so that more time and focus can go to the group project. **The number of assignments and hand-ins were already reduced from previous years, from the once remaining I can only see one that could be taken away without change the examination formats in the courseplan.**

2. Students felt there was some difficulty at the start in distinguishing between the goals of the course and those of a design project. **Yes, two of the cases were very close to design briefs. However, this was the cases we managed to gather for this year and there had been several discussions between the course responsible and the case-owner to lower the expectations on the designwork. This year I am planning to look further into institutions/organisations that could have cases that are less leaning towards design-briefs.**

They recommended making this distinction explicit to both students and potential case owners during project planning, and emphasising that students come from cultural studies and will approach challenges from that perspective. **This point was made several times with the case-owner, and personally I did not see this as a problem in the end, it was also clarified to the students that there were no expectations on them to present design-work.**

3. Involvement and follow-up with supervisors and case owners. Students would like supervisors to be invited to some lectures or seminars so that expectations and possible tension points within the group or between actors can be discussed. **It is a good idea, but there are not enough hours for that in the course. Then we have to take away time for supervision, presentation, or lectures.**

4. Programme-level suggestions. One student proposed renaming the master's programme *Cultural Theory and Practice* to clarify its purpose for students, teachers, and employers. The same student recommended scheduling the practice component (practical skills and applied theory) so that it does not compete with earlier papers, and placing the Impact part after students have delivered something, tailored to help them apply it to their output. **I pass this on to the program responsible.**

Comments on the oral evalution:

Supervision:

- Supervision generally worked well, but not all groups felt they received equally timely help from their supervisors.
- *Next year:* clarify expectations for supervisors, and if a supervisor does not have the practical time, they should not supervise. **There is a written guide on what should be included in the supervision hours that has been sent out and communicated to the supervisors. At the moment I don´t know which of the supervisors there were complaints about, so I can´t say much about it. From my perspective supervision has worked well.**
- Both internal presentations were good, but students wanted more time for feedback at the first feedback session. **Difficult once again, because of the limited numbers of hours – something else must be taken away.**
- The way peer-review feedback was organised was appreciated.

Classes and lectures

- Students were satisfied with the teaching.
- Topics they would have liked added:
    - Project management, project structure, roles, and project dynamics **There was a workshop on these topics so someone might have missed it.**
    - Visualisation: how to present ideas and models visually (suggested as a workshop) **Good idea, maybe it is possible to give some time to this within the course hour budget.**
    - How to manage case owners' expectations (a discussion would suffice) **This should be part of supervision, and if that is not sufficient they knew they can contact me (one group also did so) for support.**

Research impact component

This component is not officially part of the course, but a way to implement research into eduction. This component might not work and will be discussed with course responsible.

Non-examined assignments

- Considered good.
- It would help to explain why students should save, digitise, or photograph their ideas before the workshop, since the material is divided up afterwards. **There was a written explaination for that in the task, maybe the student did not read it.**

Examined assignments

- Considered good.
- The oral presentation became stressful at first because case owners arrived late.
- Case owners and supervisors coming and going was disruptive. Suggestions:
    - Schedule 5-minute breaks between presentations so people can enter and leave without disturbing.
    - Inform students early that supervisors and case owners may only attend their own group's presentation (staying longer is a bonus).
    - Welcome everyone at the start and lighten the mood, as some students were nervous.**Yes this could be improved, It got lost since the case-owner for the first presentation came late.**

Both supervisors and case-owners were invited to participate for the whole afternoon. In a very late stage (the same day more or less) several announced that they could only be there during their groups presentation. I will structure this differently next year.

Other

- The course was experienced as very well organised, which was appreciated (students felt not all programme courses have been).
- Many students were still struggling with assignments from the previous course (position papers 1 and 2), which interfered with this course. **Yes, this seems to be a problem that I have to bring up with the program responsible, although it is a problem outside the course but affects the start of the course.**
- Group work can be burdened when some students work a lot outside their studies or travel during the course. **Yes, group work is always a bit risky. The group contract, supervision, and the possibility to contact me were all presented as parts to help to ease internal problems in the group. But I suggest to have a lecture/seminar/workshop next year specifically addressing the group work aspect as there has been one group that has not worked – which we did not find out about until after the course had finished.**

Action plan **(To be completed by the course coordinator)**

The underlaying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

The following changes are planned in the short and long term:
WHAT should be done, WHO should do it and WHEN should it be done?

- As we have less and not more hours for the course next spring, I (course responsible)will have a discussion on what teaching activities we should focus our attention to. All though all lectures where appreachiated, some might be of less importance than others. But I will include the workshop/seminar or groupwork. I will shorten the course introduction in order to swap hours.
- The impact component will be removed (that is not on the course hour budget)
- There will be a written part on support on the canvas page. (written by course responsible and published no later than course start)
- Two of the case-owners will not be asked this spring since they had problems to fulfill their obligation that comes with being a case-owner.

Remember to orally feedback the results of the course evaluation to
• the students who have completed the course evaluation
• the students of the next course round, i.e. the next time the course is given